DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 346 CS 211 406

AUTHOR Moxley, Joseph M.; Olson, Gary A.
TITLE The Role of the Modern English Department Chair.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (39th, St. Louis, MO, March 17-19, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Deans; Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Role; College Administration; *Department Heads; *English Departments; Higher Education; Questionnaires; Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

To determine how deans as a group perceive the role of the English department chair, a study surveyed the deans of Arts and Sciences of 350 randomly selected universities with enrollments over 10,000 students (with a 51% response rate). The questionnaire solicited data about the tasks and qualities of chairmanship, referring both to specific activities of the chair, such as managing the department budget, and general leadership activities, such as delegating responsibility. Results indicated that deans felt strongest about five key aspects of chairmanship: (1) managing departmental budgets; (2) possessing strong communication skills; (3) encouraging faculty development; (4) communicating regularly with the dean; and (5) rewarding/applauding faculty achievement. In the category of managerial activities, a majority of deans emphasized the importance of the chairman's ability to make independent decisions, and maintain an open information policy. Program development was not a highly rated responsibility. Qualities listed frequently which were not on the questionnaire included honesty, interpersonal skills, problem-solving abilities, and a sense of humor. (A sample questionnaire is included.) (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297346

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joseph W Morley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Role of the Modern English Department Chair

It is fair to say that chairing an academic department in a university is a complex and demanding task. This is perhaps especially true when that department happens to be English, often one of the largest and most pluralistic in the university. The role of English department chair has become even more complex over the last twenty years because the position has changed radically in response to changes in the general academic power structure. Many chairs, writing in the pages of ADE Bulletin, have bemoaned what Marilyn Williamson calls the "erosion of the status and power of that office" (5). Once a potent power-broker, the modern chair is becoming more a bureaucratic office manager. Also, the type of person likely to fill the position of chair has changed. Previously, writes John Roberts, chairmanship was "conferred on a faculty member who, because of his scholarly productivity and reputation, could quite rightfully command authority among his peers. . . . Nowadays, the chairman may not be the most visible scholar on the faculty; in fact, he is very likely to be a young professor, still developing and growing in his career, and not infrequently he, or she (certainly a major shift), may still be an associate professor" (31). The fact that the role of chair has changed substantially over the last few decades has made it increasingly more difficult to determine exactly what factors contribute to effective chairmanship.

Professional journals such as ADE Bulletin continue to publish numerous articles that attempt to define the role of the English department chair, but most of these accounts are anecdotal, impressionistic reflections on the

CS211406

authors' experiences as chairpersons. While these accounts are helpful, in that they allow chairs to speculate about their shared experience, they are also limited. Very little systematic research has been conducted into the role of the modern English department chair. One notable study was conducted in 1985 by the Institute for Departmental Leadership (IDL) at Florida State University. The IDL surveyed English department chairs, soliciting information about the structure of their positions as well as their perceptions of their roles as chairpersons. Like the articles published in ADE Bulletin, however, the source of information for the IDL study was chairs themselves. Many questions remain unanswered. What specific qualities and skills must a chair possess? What tasks or sub-roles are most important? What are the prevailing misconceptions about chairmanship? Perhaps chairs themselves are not in the best position to answer these questions objectively. It seems reasonable to assume that the persons most capable of assessing the attributes of effective chairmanship are those who must supervise and evaluate chairs: their deans. Also, since they must supervise chairs of several departments simultaneously, deans are best able to compare and contrast the roles of chairs as they relate to specific departments; that is, deans are at least in a position to be able to make sharp distinctions between types of chairs.

METHODOLOGY

In order to determine how deans as a group perceive the role of the English department chair, we distributed a questionnaire to the Deans of Arts and Sciences of universities across the nation. We felt that such information would add a new perspective to the on-going discussion about English department chairmanship, supplementing the anecdotal self-reflections avail-

able in the professional literature. We targeted universites with enrollments of over 10,000 students, in order to survey a range of institutions from medium/small to large. We selected 350 of these institutions at random, although we did make sure that every state was represented. One hundred and seventy-four deans from almost every state responded. This high response rate (51%) is encouraging, since it indicates that the study's data are particularly reliable.

The questionnaire solicits data about the tasks and qualities of chairmanship. Some of the items refer to the specific activities of the chair (managing the department budget, for example), while others refer to general leadership activities (such as delegating responsibility).

The questionnaire asks respondents to rate 21 items on a four-point scale from "essential" to "not important." This continuum enabled the deans to rate the importance of each item and allowed us to get a sense of the deans' priorities. The four remaining questions solicit brief answers. Printed below is the questionnaire:

Leadership Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: The first 21 statements relate to activities of the department chair. Please rate each one on the 1-4 scale by checking the appropriate box. The remaining questions ask for brief answers.

	essential 4	very important 3	important 2	not important 1
1) delegates authority				
2) manages department budget				
3) schedules regular faculty meetings				
4) maintains his or her own scholarship				
5) makes independent decisions				
6) possesses strong communication skills				
7) applauds/rewards faculty achievement				
8) attempts to unify faculty				
9) implements dean's policies				
10) expresses departmental policy in written documents				
11) establishes liaisons with community				
12) encourages faculty development				
13) receives outstanding teaching evaluations				
14) develops new programs				
15) maintains social relationships with faculty				
16) criticizes poor work				
17) handles political problems				
18) maintains an open information policy				
19) communicates regularly with the dean				
20) familiarizes the dean with critical research and issues in the Chair's field				
21) remains available throughout the work day				

22) Should the Chair primarily represent the A) faculty or B) the administration?_____

23) Of the 21 leadership qualities mentioned above, please rank the 5 most important (use the numbers, e.g., 1-21): ____; ____; ____; ____; ____.

24) What important qualities are not listed in this questionnaire?_____

_____

_____

25) Please comment on the aspects of chairmanship that you consider most important:_____

FIVE KEY CONCERNS

As a group, deans feel strongest about five key aspects of chairmanship. The majority considers the ability to manage the departmental budget to be the highest priority. While 118 respondents (68%) consider this ability to be "essential," only 3 respondents claim that it is "not important." In fact, in ranking "the most important" leadership qualities (question #23), more deans list budget management first than they do any other item. To stress this importance even further, several deans reiterate in their prose remarks that "the ability to work with the department's budget is to me the most important." Another writes, "The chair is accountable for the budget, which must be managed for optimum faculty and student benefit." And another comments, "They must be prudent managers of the department's budget." Clearly, most deans perceive skillful budget management to be one of the most important abilities of the English Department chair.

Despite the importance of budget management, it is safe to assume that most faculty members trained principally in the humanities are not, at least at first, proficient in this sophisticated skill. In all probability, a high proportion of English department chairs receive their principal training in managing budgets via trial and error. In fact, according to the IDL study, a sizeable number of chairs never received formal training of any kind before assuming chairmanship. In response to the IDL survey, 68% of the chairs say they believe that department chairs should receive some form of training for the position, and they list "budget preparation" at the top of the list of areas that such training should include. In addition, the chairs responding to the IDL survey rank "preparing and administering the budget" second only to "maintaining an active research program" as the activity "most important to success as a chairperson." Given the importance of this skill, indicated

both by chairs and deans, higher administration should, perhaps, provide in-service training in financial management to incoming chairs.

Second in importance in the opinion of most deans is that the chair should "possess strong communication skills." Only one respondent rates this trait as "not important," while 113 (65%) believe that it is "essential." In responding to question 23, most deans rank this trait second in importance to all the other qualities. In response to the open-ended questions, several deans list communicative abilities as paramount. One writes, "Management and communication skills are essential. The job requires a clear and organized thinker and a person who can communicate effectively with all areas of the college." Another writes, "The chair must be a spokesman for the department to the dean and others and must be able to explain the needs of the department; this necessitates strong communication skills which must go in both directions: to the faculty and to the dean. This includes clarifying issues, and political savvy!"[1]

Third in importance is that the chair should "encourage faculty development." An overwhelming 154 respondents (89%) feel that this role is either "essential" or "very important"; only one respondent claims that it is "not important." Clearly, the deans believe that a strong leader must play an active role in increasing scholarly productivity and professional enrichment among faculty. The deans write that the chair must "be able to recognize quality scholarship and help others do the same." The chair "must articulate intellectual and pedagogical principles and see that they are lived up to." And he or she "must establish within the department a professional atmosphere that encourages all faculty to do their scholarship well and cooperate with one another."[2]

This emphasis on scholarly productivity is noticeable in many of the

questionnaire responses. One dean writes, "Recognizing the scholarly strengths and weaknesses of the staff and capitalizing on their abilities is the key to productivity." Says another, "The chair must create an atmosphere of intellectual liveliness" because the chair is "the voice of the discipline, and this is of critical importance to the administration." That is, the chair needs to "motivate faculty to effect positive change" because the chair is "the key person in faculty development: the mentor for young faculty and the lead person for professional renewal for the senior faculty." In other words, the deans perceive the chair to be a "strong champion of faculty development and scholarship," the intellectual leader of the department, responsible for directing and encouraging scholarly activity and promoting a general environment of "intellectual liveliness."

This emphasis on scholarship is reiterated in the responses to item #4. Most deans feel that the chair should "maintain his or her own scholarship." In fact, 36 respondents (21%) say that this is "essential," 72 (41%) that it is "very important," and 57 (33%) that it is "important." Only 9 deans feel that a chair does not need to maintain personal scholarship.[3] Many deans devote their prose remarks to this issue. According to one respondent, "a good chair would much rather be teaching and involved in scholarly pursuits" than in administrative ones. The chair must remain "at the cutting edge of the discipline"; he or she must be "an intellectual trailblazer" who has "great intellectual breadth and vigor" and who has "a strong reputation as a scholar."

Undoubtedly, these deans are saying that an effective chair is much more than a good manager; while the chair must possess administrative accumen, he or she must first be a true scholar who actively encourages scholarship among the faculty, especially through good example: his or her own scholarly

activity. This emphasis on the chair's scholarship seems to reaffirm the notion of the chairperson as the department's most distinguished scholar. However, it may be that such a notion is residual, heldover from a by-gone era, and that the deans have not carefully analyzed their priorities. It is clear from this study that the deans overwhelmingly have chosen managerial skills and responsibilities as the most important factors in effective chairmanship. The chairs, too, perceive managerial skills to be the most important factors of successful chairmanship. Thus, it may be that the chair's scholarly productivity really is not as important as the respondents have said it is.

Fourth in importance to the majority of respondents is that the chair must "communicate regularly with the dean." Only three respondents find this to be unimportant, while 106 (61%) find it to be "essential." Another 40 (23%) claim it is "very important" and 25 (14%) see it as "important." One dean writes that the chair "must always keep the dean apprised of department pressure points," while another comments that "essential is the chair's ability to articulate, clearly and forcefully, departmental perspective to the dean and the dean's central administration." In fact, several respondents claim that the chair's regular communication should go beyond the level of the dean: "Because of the central curriculum role played by an English department, close contact by the chair with other campus academic units is required." Says another, "the chairman must communicate constantly with the dean as well as with other departments." It is not surprising that the respondents believe that communicating regularly with the dean is so important; any specialist in organizational management will stress that such "lateral communication" is of vital importance to the smooth operation of any large, hierarchical organization.

Related to the chair's regular communication with the dean is the chair's attempt to "implement the dean's policies." Understandably, only one respondent believes that this is not an important responsibility of the chair. Seventy-six respondents (44%) say this responsibility is "essential"; 52 (30%) "very important"; and 45 (26%) "important." The deans write: "The chair must always represent the dean fairly"; "The chair must implement the dean's policies and the college's mission as they relate to the department"; and "The chair must be able to explain carefully the dean's policies and goals." One respondent comments rather emphatically, "A chair would be a complete failure if he (she) failed to convey to faculty the reasons underlying decisions or actions of the dean." It is interesting to note, though, that this communication with the dean does not extend to "familiarizing the dean with critical research and issues in the chair's field"; in fact, this item received one of the lowest ratings on the questionnaire.

The fifth of the five most important aspects of chairmanship is that the chair "applauds/rewards faculty achievement." An overwhelming 93% of the respondents see this role as either "essential" or "very important"; not a single dean sees it as unimportant. This role, of course, is closely related to the faculty development issue already discussed. One respondent comments, "Not only should the chair applaud faculty achievement, but he should work as a mentor to junior faculty, helping them get publications together, submitted, revised, and so on." The fact that these two faculty development issues were both part of the top five indicates that faculty-chair relations are central to a smooth-running department and that as an effective manager, the chair shapes the department in subtle ways, through coaching, guiding, directing. However, the deans do not believe that this close faculty-chair contact should extend to the personal. Of all 21 items listed on the ques-

tionnaire's rating scale, the one that is clearly the least important in the eyes of the deans is number 15: the chair "maintains social relationships with faculty." While some administrators specifically choose to cultivate social relationships with faculty as a way of fostering trust, understanding, and empathy, the deans find such contact superfluous. Only five respondents (3%) rate this item "essential," while 58 (33%) rate it "not important."

MANAGERIAL ACTIVITIES

Of the items we might loosely call "managerial activities," a majority of the respondents (83%) believe that it is "essential" or "very important" that the chair "make independent decisions." According to the deans, the chair must be able "to lead an effective decision-making process, both in planning and implementing policy"; "to make unpopular decisions and to carry out unpopular policies without transferring responsibility to another person or group"; and "to understand how to make independent decisions." The respondents feel strongly about this issue; however, several mention that the chair must be able to balance independent decision making with faculty involvement in the creation of policy. Only 9 deans report that it is "not important that a chair is able to delegate authority." One respondent explains: "The chair must have the ability to generate confidence about his judgment but must be willing to collaborate for the common good." Says another, "An effective English department chair must know how to balance the demands of involving faculty in decision-making and of asserting strong individual leadership. All chairmen must find this kind of balance, but the generally large size of English departments makes this task most difficult for the English department chair. I know—I was one."

In addition, a majority of the deans (87%) feel that it is either

"essential" or "very important" that the chair "maintain an open information policy," but, strangely enough, most do not believe that it is necessary to "express departmental policy in written documents." We had presumed that an effective chair would seek to avoid the potential ambiguity of orally-expressed policy by stating such policy formally in written form; apparently, however, the deans do not find such a measure to be necessary. This open information issue seems to be a part of the larger issue of "fairness." A substantial number of respondents list "fairness" as an important quality not contained in the questionnaire. One dean comments, "The chairman must be fair and familiarize the faculty with critical issues facing the college and university." Says another, "The chair should deal objectively with students, faculty, and others and must have integrity and fairness beyond reproach."

This larger issue of fairness seems to be a major concern of the deans, especially as it relates to faculty evaluation. One dean comments, "The chair must be a person of high integrity; justice and fairness are the most essential qualities. The position is not a popularity contest--the chair need not be liked but must be respected." Another says, "The chairman must treat colleagues fairly and honestly, distributing salary increases equitably and fairly according to merit." A third writes that the chair must "develop standards for faculty evaluation that are understood by all faculty and that are free from bias." Says another, "Fairness and integrity are ESSENTIAL. The chair must keep a level temper and must not punish his/her enemies." These and other emphatic statements illustrate that fairness is a high priority. Even if a chair's policies and decisions are unpopular, they must be judicious.

Related to the open information issue, and perhaps also to fairness, is whether the chair should "schedule regular faculty meetings." Only 8 deans

feel this is unimportant; the others are split fairly equally along the scale from "essential" (54) to "very important" (67) to "important" (45). Certainly, regular meetings allow the chair to communicate policy and decisions directly to the faculty and allow the faculty a forum to discuss and debate issues of importance; providing faculty with such a forum is at least a symbol of a chair's "fairness," if not much more. Evidentally, many chairs are aware of the importance of regular meetings. The IDL study shows that 41% of the chairs hold about four to six faculty meetings during the academic year.

A key issue, reiterated almost ad nauseum in the professional literature, is the chair's role as a politician in the pluralistic, often seething political hotbed that is the modern English department. For example, John Gerber writes in ADE Bulletin:

> We must be politicians. . . . We must serve as adjudicators, somehow resolving the differences between the students and the faculty, the junior and the senior faculty, the department and the administration, the scholars and the creative writers, the literary historians and the literary critics, the teachers of literature and the teachers of composition, those who prize teaching most highly and those who prize research most highly, the faculty and the secretaries, the secretaries and the custodians, those who smoke and those who don't, the male chauvinists and the women's libbers, the newer members of the department who are highly paid and the older members of the department who are poorly paid, and those who constantly want a lighter load because of their research and those who resent those who constantly want a lighter load because of their research. (1-2)

This role of chair as politician/adjudicator, discussed so often by chairs in the professional literature, is also a subject of concern to deans. In fact, the respondents pay considerable attention to departmental politics. A huge percentage (84%) believe that it is either "essential" or "very important" that the chair "attempt to unify faculty," and an almost equal number feel that the chair must have the ability to "handle political problems." Several deans write that the chair must remain "apolitical," while more contend that the chair must exhibit "political savvy." A dean of a large, southern university philosophizes, "Serving as a chair is a hard job because most of us are not well-prepared to handle the political conflicts and their concomitant responsibilities." Another dean directly addresses one of the most volatile political issues currently dividing many English departments nationally: "The chair must attempt to effectively bridge the gap between composition and literature faculty." Thus, the effective chair must maintain a delicate balance between remaining non-political personally, while arbitrating and solving various political squabbles department-wide; it's no wonder that "most of us are not well prepared" for such a sophisticated managerial task.

We were surprised to discover that the deans do not rate program development very highly. For example, only 21 deans say that it is "essential" that the chair "develop new programs," and only 7 say that it is "essential" that the chair "establish liaisons with the community." The majority of respondents see both activities as "important." While a few respondents mention in their prose remarks that a good chair is imaginative and able to "develop new programs by creating, devising, and implementing radical departures in the discipline," such programmatic concerns are clearly lower in priority than many other issues listed in the questionnaire. In contrast,

the IDL survey reveals that chairs find "improving academic programs" and "initiating new programs" to be the two "most rewarding, satisfying and enjoyable" activities of their positions.

THE QUESTION OF REPRESENTATION

The question that generated the most response from the deans is #22: "Should the chair primarily represent A) the faculty or B) the administration?" Certainly, this question has been the subject of a long-standing debate in the professional literature. We purposely did not include a third choice (i.e., "both") because we wanted to see how the deans would respond when forced to decide between the two choices. The results are quite interesting, in that they demonstrate that the debate still rages. Of the 174 respondents, 95 (55%) marked "faculty," 21 (12%) marked "administration," and 58 (33%) supplied their own third choice: "both." This issue of representation is so heated that more deans address it in their prose remarks than any other single issue. In defending the chair's representation of the administration, one dean writes, "The chairman should represent management; our chair is appointed, not elected." Another, referring to Louis XIV's legendary proclamation, writes, "The administration, of course. L'etat, c'est moi!"--the state, it is I.

In contrast, one respondent says that the chair must "be a spokesman for the department to the dean and other administrators and must be able to explain the needs of the department." A second explains that "Because the chair is a member of the faculty union, his role is collegial and not administrative. He is a spokesperson for equals." Writes a third, "An effective chair represents the best interests of the faculty—not necessarily what interests the faculty at a given moment--to the dean in a forthright

manner. The chair must understand the staff thoroughly."

The most vocal respondents, however, are those who see the chair as a dual representative: an effective chair needs the ability "to keep the dean and the faculty happy at the same time--which is near impossible"; "to represent to the administration the needs of the faculty and the programs in the department and at the same time demonstrate sensitivity to and understanding of administrative stands and positions"; and "to perform an ambivalent role somewhere between advocacy for faculty and implementation of administrative policies." Another dean quips, "This is akin to the Miller Lite 'less filling--great taste' dispute. The chairman (either sex) should represent English."

Certainly, the issue of representation is a difficult one and is far from being resolved. It is clear that some deans and their institutions perceive the chair as primarily a part of management; and it is hard to deny that this perception is at least partly correct, since most chairs have the power of hiring, firing and promoting faculty. In fact, the IDL study reveals that only 17% of the chairs who responded were elected by department faculty; all others were appointed by administration. Compounding the issue is the fact that collective bargaining agreements can play an important role in determining whether the chair represents faculty or administration. However, the influence of collective bargaining may be smaller than most people believe. According to the IDL study, only 20% of the chairs' universities are unionized, and 33% of these chairs remain outside of the bargaining unit.

ADDITIONAL QUALITIES

When asked what important qualities are not listed on the questionnaire, the respondents provided several additions; four of these additions were

reiterated constantly: honesty, interpersonal skills, problem-solving abilities, and a sense of humor. Many respondents simply wrote the words "honesty and integrity." One dean comments, "Honesty and integrity in dealing with faculty are essential." Another says, "To me, honesty and diligence are the most important aspects of chairmanship." This concern with honesty dovetails with the concern for fairness. Clearly, the deans expect an effective chair to possess a high degree of integrity in managing the affairs of the department.

Even more important, judging by the number of responses, is the possession of effective interpersonal skills. Many respondents simply wrote that the chair must be "people oriented." One dean says, "Personality factors are extremely important, even though they are hard to quantify." The chair needs to possess "various people-related skills because his primary function, after all, is motivation and leadership." Evidently, "getting along well with varied personality types and not showing favoritism" are important because "being a chair is 85% public relations." According to one dean, the chair must exhibit "a great personality and be a people-oriented person" because "no chair can function without effective human relations skills and social skills." Since the chair constantly deals with people--students, faculty, administration--he or she must possess those skills that will enable him or her to coordinate and manage the various self interests that often are in conflict.

In fact, skill in problem-solving, especially as it relates to conflict resolution, seems to be the very most important item not included on the questionnaire. Over one-third of the respondents mention this aspect of chairmanship. Here are three typical responses: "The chair must be able to resolve conflicts (especially between students and faculty) effectively and

promptly," and "He must take a creative approach to problem-solving," and "The most important aspect of the chair's job is to solve problems effectively. They always arise and enormous time and energy is spent solving problems. However, problem-solving is never listed as a job criterion. It should be." It is not surprising that the deans consider this skill to be so important; it is the nature of an administrator's job to confront and resolve countless problems. In fact, specialists in organizational management and human resource management are finding a great demand among administrators and managers for seminars and courses in problem-solving techniques.

Perhaps our biggest surprise in this survey is that the deans believe that a "sense of humor" is an important quality of chairmanship. Many deans simply wrote down the words "a sense of humor," and a few emphasized the importance of this trait by punctuating the words with exclamation points. One dean writes, "The chair must have an iron constitution and a great sense of humor." And as if to illustrate this very same sense of humor, this dean continues, "And the chair must have an appreciation for the dean's poetry!" Certainly, a sense of humor will be invaluable in helping an administrator cope with the many conflicts and problems that arise daily. Perhaps what these deans are really saying, though, is that effective chairmanship demands a certain kind of temperament--one which allows the chair to remain sufficiently thick-skinned to prevent taking every conflict personally, and sufficiently even-tempered to be able to recognize the absurd and the humorous even in the most difficult situations.

While the deans pay considerable attention to the four qualities just mentioned, they also list others they think are important. Several respondents were concerned that the questionnaire does not mention students: "Meeting the needs of students is the most important aspect of chairmanship

not listed," and "The chair needs to be concerned for the welfare of students," and "The chair must be student oriented and be able to use his/her problem-solving abilities to assist the student." Other respondents mention the importance of effective faculty recruitment and a commitment to affirmative action. Here is a list of some of the miscellaneous qualities, taken verbatim from the questionnaire responses:

- personal stamina and judicious temperament
- honesty, courage, stamina, energy
- vision, the ability to motivate
- ability to lead and follow simultaneously
- tact, common sense, patience and creativity
- consistency, reliability, emotional stability
- a positive, outgoing attitude
- resilience and the ability to command respect
- imagination, strength, collegiality
- courage
- tact, veracity, resourcefulness and conscientiousness
- ability to withstand criticism with little reward
- patience and persistence in the face of irresolvable problems
- minimum EGO needs.
- the main rule of chairmanship: NO SURPRISES!

A FINAL NOTE

It is clear that the role of English department chair has changed radically. No longer is the old-fashioned "honorific" chairmanship tenable. As John Roberts puts it:

More and more departments are beginning to recognize that the spe-

> cific skills and abilities required of an effective chairman are not necessarily the same as those needed for the publishing scholar.... A good chairman needs to be a person capable of handling these complexities and not everyone on the professional staff is equally qualified for the job. (31)

Judging from the information gathered in this study, Roberts is right. The modern chair must possess a bewildering array of sophisticated skills and qualities--attributes that seem more appropriate for a business manager than for a scholar of the humanities. This modern chair must be an entrepreneur, a money manager, a communications/public relations specialist, a political arbitrator, an expert in problem-solving, and much more. In discussing this new breed of chairperson, Joseph Millichap writes, "Let me boldly assert that we all do 'management'. . . . Finally, in the broad, philosophical sense we are all 'managers,' and we can learn some important things from the consideration of both management practice and theory" (50). Millichap's advice is apt, for if this study illustrates anything, it is that the effective English department chair is, above all, a dynamic and skillful manager of resources and personnel.

NOTES

[1]While the deans find communication skills to be extremely important, the chairs generally ignore this issue in their published articles. The IDL study does not address this issue either; however, 68% of the respondents to the IDL questionnaire state that they are in favor of a training program for chairs that includes instruction in communication skills.

[2]Apparently, it is necessary that the chair encourage faculty development and scholarship. According to the IDL study, 72% of the chairs claim that their faculty is more interested in teaching than in research, and 92% say that their faculty actually spends more time on teaching than on research.

[3]The IDL survey reveals that chairs spend, on average, 12% of their total work time on scholarly research and professional development.

Works Cited

Gerber, John. "The Roles of the Chairman." ADE Bulletin 60 (Feb. 1979): 1-8.

"English Department Chairperson Questionnaire: Summary of Results." Institute for Departmental Leadership. Tallahassee, FL, July 1985, 1-9.

Millichap, Joseph. "Contemporary Management Theory and the English Department." ADE Bulletin 85 (Winter 1986): 50-53.

Roberts, John. "Reflections on the Chairmanship." ADE Bulletin 59 (Nov. 1978): 31-34.

Williamson, Marilyn. "Chairman of the Department, 1976." ADE Bulletin 51 (Nov. 1976): 5-9.